

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 12-24 are current pending. Applicants have amended claims 12, 13, and 24. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Claims 12-24 stand rejected as being anticipated by Edwards et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,592,076).

Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

A telephone interview was conducted with Examiner Meucci on Monday, January 29, 2009, at 1:00 pm Eastern Time. The undersigned attorney represented the Applicants in the interview. In the interview, Applicants' proposed amendments to claims 12 and 24 were discussed. While no specific agreement was reached, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's helpful review of the claims and suggestion that including some of the features recited in the claims of the parent to this case (now U.S. Patent No.) may help to place the claims in the present application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the independent claims of the present application to include some of the features of the

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 12-24 stand rejected as being anticipated by Edwards.

Applicants have amended independent claims 12 and 24, and Applicants submit that Edwards fails to teach all of the features recited in claims 12 and 24. For example, claim 12 recites, in part, a method of processing information for use on a network, the method comprising:

mounting the agent card into one of the plurality of agency base units by inserting the agent card into the agency base unit;
in response to mounting the agent card into the base unit,
instantiating the at least one response functionality using an on board processor of the agent card;
after instantiating the at least one response functionality of the agent card, providing an agent identifier from the agent card to the agency base

unit identifying the at least one response functionality instantiated on the agent card;

receiving, via the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality, the request including the agent identifier;

executing the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request; and

updating the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality.

Applicants submit that Edwards fails to teach at least these features of claim 12.

Edwards fails to teach “mounting the agent card into one of the plurality of agency base units by inserting the agent card into the agency base unit” and “in response to mounting the agent card into the base unit, instantiating the at least one response functionality using an on board processor of the agent card” as recited in claim 12. Edwards does not teach or even suggest these features of claim 12. The Office Action equates the repositories 14a-14n of Fig. 3 of Edwards to the agent cards recited in claim 12 and equates the principals 18a-18n of Fig. 3 of Edwards to the agency base unit recited in claim 12. But, Edwards does not teach or suggest that the repositories are “mounted” in the principals by “inserting the agent card into the agency base unit” as recited in claim 12. In Edwards, the principals access data from the repositories using bit providers that communicate with the repositories using appropriate storage protocols. See Edwards, Fig. 3, reference no. 16, and col. 11, lines 17-20. Edwards does not indicate that the repositories are implemented as a physical device that is inserted into a principal. Furthermore, the repositories in Edwards do not appear to include an on board processor for “instantiating the at least one response functionality” as recited in claim 12. In Edwards the repositories are merely storage locations for document content, not executable functionality, nor does Edwards describe instantiating such executable functionality on the repository using an on board processor.

Edwards also does not teach “after instantiating the at least one response functionality of the agent card, providing an agent identifier from the agent card to the agency base unit identifying the at least one response functionality instantiated on the agent card” as recited in claim 12. Edwards does not teach that the repositories notify the principals of an

“agent identifier” as recited in claim 12. Instead, in Edwards, each “base document” maintained by the principals has an associated “bit provider” that is used to fetch the document content from the repositories. See Edwards, col. 8, lines 54-58 and 61-65. The identity of the repositories storing the various components of a document must be known at the time that content is added to the base document. Otherwise, the bit provider would have no way of determining where the content is stored.

Edwards also does not teach “receiving, at the agency base unit in which the agent card is mounted, a request to execute the at least one response functionality, the request including the agent identifier” and “executing the at least one response functionality using the processor of the agent card in response to the request” as recited in claim 12. In Edwards, the content repositories are accessed when a user requests content via an application, such as a word processing application, running on one of the front end components 10a-10n. See Edwards, col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 5. The user application in Edwards merely requests a document from one of the principals 18a-18n and the principal then requests document content from one or more of the repositories via a “bit provider.” Edwards does not indicate that the applications request that the repository execute “at least one response functionality” or that the processor of the repository executes the at least one response functionality. As described above, the repositories of Edwards do not appear to store executable content nor do they appear to include a processor for executing such content.

Edwards also does not teach “updating the state for the at least one response functionality on the agent card in response to executing the at least one response functionality” as recited in claim 12. In Edwards, the state of a document is not stored in the repositories (which the Office Action has equated to the agent cards recited in claim 12). Instead, the repositories merely serve as a source of document content. The state of a document, such as how content from the repositories is organized in the document, is stored in a “base document” (Fig. 3, reference nos. 20a-20n). Each base document is associated with a principal, and the principal customizes the base document by attaching properties (e.g., Fig. 3, reference nos. 22 and 24) to the base document. When the principal accesses the base document, the properties attached to the

Appl. No. 10/697,606
Amdt. dated January 29, 2009
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2142

PATENT

base document are used to provide the principal with a version of the document with the content organized according to the principal's needs. See Edwards, col. 12, lines 10-35. If a user makes update to a document, the "base document" associated with the principal is updated, but the state of the content used to form the document that is stored in one or more repositories is not changed.

For at least the reasons provided, Edwards fails to anticipate claim 12. Independent claim 24 should be allowable for similar reasons as claim 12. Claims 13-23, which depend from claim 12, should also be in condition for allowance, at least due to their dependence from independent claim 12.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 12-24 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 858-350-6100.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey S. King
Reg. No. 58,791

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 858-350-6100
Fax: 415-576-0300
JSK:sjs
61690515 v2